

REMARKS

Applicant filed a response on January 21, 2010 to the non-final Office Action mailed October 5, 2009. On March 8, 2010, the Examiner telephoned the Applicant to notify him that all claims were allowable over the art of record, but that claim 27 contained an error that rendered the claim confusing. Particularly, the position of the switching fabric as recited in claim 27 was incorrect and did not match the figures. Left uncorrected, the error would support a §112 rejection of claim 27. After reviewing the claims, Applicant corrected the error, but also noticed typographical errors in other claims. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the claims, without adding new matter, to correct these errors and to clarify the claim language. No new matter has been added.


Particularly, independent claim 24 has been amended to now recite the structure of only a single optical component instead of first and second optical components. The second optical component is now introduced in dependent claim 25. Additionally, Applicant has corrected a typographical error in claim 25 such that the limitation "an evaluating circuit...received light arriving at the light sensor" now recites, "an evaluating circuit...reflected light arriving at the light sensor." Claim 26 has been amended to recite a second transmitter laser that transmits a value of the time delay detected by the evaluating circuit over the other end of the bi-directional fiber. Claim 27 has been amended to clarify that the switch is disposed between the optical circulator and the light sensor, as is seen in the figures. Further, Applicant has amended the dependent claims to ensure uniformity of terms and phrases between the claims and the specification. Finally, Applicant has added new claims 30 and 31 to further define the second optical component as being either another intermediate amplifier (claim 30), or a network node (claim 31).

None of the new claims adds new matter and all are fully supported by the as-filed specification. The amendments are intended merely to clarify the claim language and to correct

obvious §112 errors. Therefore, the claims are allowable over the art of record for the reasons previously set forth in Applicant's January 21, 2010 response.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,
COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.



Stephen A. Herrera
Registration No.: 47,642

Dated: March 22, 2010

1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300
Cary, NC 27518

Telephone: (919) 854-1844
Facsimile: (919) 854-2084